

64 said second jaw portion comprising a crimp gripping and crushing projection which is operative to move toward said crimp space between said first wall and said second wall as the interactive jaw portions are pivoted to a closed, crimp-crushing position.

REMARKS

The amendments made herein are believed to be clearly supported by the disclosure of this application.

Referring particularly to claim 12, the first and second walls of the first pliers jaw 48 are clearly shown, with the crimp space 58 therebetween. The first and second crimp-retaining prongs 56 are also illustrated.

The second jaw portion 46 is shown to comprise a crimp gripping and crushing projection which is clearly operative to move toward crimp space 58 between the first wall and the second wall of the first jaw portion 48.

The examiner is requested to review the response to Office Action dated May 5, 2003. In summary, with respect to the examiner's rejection of Burke Patent 5,545,168, used in the rejection of claim 1, Burke clearly fails to show the "crimp gripping and crushing projection which is operative to move toward said crimp space between said first wall and said second wall as the interactive jaw portions are pivoted to a closed, crimp-crushing position," as called for by new claim 12 in the last four lines (emphasis added). Similarly, as discussed, Burke fails to disclose the laterally spaced first wall and second wall of the first jaw portion 48. As discussed in the May 5 response, surface 62 of Burke is part of a solid block, not a pair of sidewalls, as claim 12 calls for. See particularly pp. 2-3 of the response.

With respect to the rejections of other claims, the examiner is urged to review the arguments raised in the cited response to Office Action. Particularly, with respect to claims 5-8 as unpatentable over Burke 5,545,168 in view of Nelson 4,643,054, it is submitted that those skilled in the art would not be led to make the combination that the examiner suggests. Burke does disclose an auxiliary handle 16, but it is not "pivotally mounted on one of said handles, as called for by claim 7. Instead, it is attached to a central pivot. The handle is used to tighten wire on a capstan.

Nelson has a little handle 50 that is carried on one of the pliers' arms, but the handle is merely for retracting a pawl 47 to disengage it from one of the notches 53 on a rack, when it is desired to open the pliers' handles. Why would those skilled in the art be led to place a pawl retracting handle in the structure of Burke, which already has an auxiliary handle, and has no pawl for release?

Accordingly, it is submitted that the combination is improper, and the claims of this application are patentable.

Respectfully submitted,
SEYFARTH SHAW



Garrettson Ellis
Registration No. 22,792
Attorney for Applicant

SEYFARTH SHAW
55 East Monroe Street, Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 269-8567



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 18, 2003.

Carson Eeri

Registered Attorney for Applicant
Date: July 18, 2003

RECEIVED

JUL 24 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700